

## "NO SKETCHING ALLOWED."

THE TEMPLE CHURCH, LONDON.

Mr. KEARNEY, the artist, has stated, in a letter to the *Morning Advertiser*, that having occasion for some specimens of pure Anglo-Norman architectural ornaments, particularly capitals and enriched columns, and passing through the Temple on Thursday, he paused under the porch of the church, and made two or three pencil-notes in his sketch-book. "Whilst thus occupied," he continues, "the door was opened to the authoritative knocking of two boys, who entered, and the person who let them in, at once commanded me to leave off. I asked why?" "Because," says he, "this is private property. It is against the law for any one to copy it. I have orders not to allow it." To my observation, that I considered that there could be no prohibition against a passenger using his eyes or his pencil in a public thoroughfare, and that the outside of any public edifice could not be considered private property to such an extent and meaning as he asserted, he replied, "that may be your notion, but that is not the point. My orders are my orders, and this is private property, and nobody has any right to take off any part of the church—it's prohibited." The writer adds that he gives publicity to this fact for the information of brother artists "who may be desirous to see a fine specimen of art, produced in the dark ages, expensively renovated, and surrounded by all the carefully preserved intolerance, and narrow-minded selfishness which distinguished the Knights Templars of the twelfth century."

We sincerely hope, for the sake of the modern Templars' character, especially as to those members of the body who loudly professed their admiration of mediæval art and their desire that its principles should be understood and studied, that the enlightened functionary who thus authoritatively laid down the law (we wonder where he found it) was acting without orders. We happen to know two or three excellent men of the "inner" and the "middle" who would blush to hear their names connected with such preposterous notions till they were deeper read than they even now are. Do, pray, good Mr. B. or Mr. H. inquire into this matter, and if there be orders existing to prevent persons from sketching your "private property" inside—from stealing any of the bits of beauty produced without any of your assistance half a thousand years ago—obtain their abrogation with all convenient speed for your own sake.

Carried out to absurdity (it is sufficiently absurd without any carrying out)—such orders would forbid visitors from remembering anything they saw there,—would prevent them from committing it even to the tablets of their memory. As to your power of preventing eager students from "taking off" the outside, notwithstanding your acute custodian who knows the law (who drinks it in with every breath he draws), the assertion must be simply a joke; you may as well think of preventing our excellent friend Punch from serving you as artists do the building, if he once gets certain of the fact that you positively are intolerant and stupid enough to desire so to interfere.

It is not at the Temple alone that the seal is put on the sketch-book. We remember going a few years ago 20 miles, to Hampton Court hall, to get the outline of two or three mouldings, and on taking out a pencil and the back of a letter, were authoritatively stopped by a man in blue, and were ultimately forced to return with simply our trouble for our pains—a proceeding the more scandalous since the public pay for maintaining the place. Not a shadow of an objection to our sketching could he raised on the plea of causing obstruction, as, with the exception of the roan in blue, we stood alone in the large hall. Whether this absurd and vexatious regulation is still acted on there we do not know,—it is to be hoped not. Even at that time, however, they did not dream, as it appears they do in the Temple, of preventing people from using a pencil in the highway, for the aforesaid man in blue, when he had politely walked us to the door, said "There, now, if you go outside you may draw away as much as you like." He seemed to have no notice of an object in drawing: to him, and probably to his masters, drawing

was drawing, and nothing more. He reminded us of a story told by Mr. Tite, at the Institute, one night, to the effect that he was sketching on one occasion a very interesting half-destroyed building in the country, and, while so occupied, heard an old woman exclaim from an open window in it, "Why, Tom, I'm dashed if there beant another fool a taking off our house." Our friend in blue had much the same notion of those who came to Hampton Court to draw.

However, gossip apart, this really is a matter worthy attention and demanding alteration. We commend it to the serious consideration of the honourable societies of the Inner and Middle Temple.

## THE HISTORY OF ARCHITECTURE.

BY AN AMERICAN LADY.

WE have read with great satisfaction a History of Architecture from the Earliest Times, written by a lady, Mrs. L. C. Tutbill, and recently published in Philadelphia.\* It is dedicated to the ladies of the United States, and, as we understand, is the first book of the kind that has yet appeared there. It consists of 426 octavo pages: and contains a large number of illustrations, some of them very fairly executed. The style is clear, the arrangement orderly, and most of the opinions it contains are sensible and sound. There is very little wrong in it,—and, what there is so, we are not going to find fault with. It is necessarily, to a great extent, a compilation, but the way in which this is made, shews that the author has well mastered her subject, and remarks are offered throughout which prove that she takes the right view of most of the current topics on which there is a question.

The main object of the writer—and an excellent one it is—is to obtain increased consideration for architecture, and to point it out to the young men of her country as a lucrative and honourable profession. "Instead of devoting so large a proportion of talent and active energy," says the author, "to the three learned professions and to commercial pursuits, it is high time to direct them into other channels. This art opens a fair field for laudable ambition."

The commencement of the preface shews the nice feeling of the writer,—a feeling, too, it should be understood, much less common in America than it is even in England. "The perception of the beautiful is among the noblest of God's gifts to man. When improved by culture, it diffuses over the poor wants of human nature a glory like sunlight upon the dark and frozen earth. The peasant of the genial south trains the jessamine over his rude porch, and beneath it, after the weary labour of the day, enjoys the 'stilly eve.' The Swiss mountaineer hangs his picturesque chalet amid the embowering trees of his native Alps, and its beauty delights the passing traveller.

With the same earnest longing for the beautiful the man of wealth calls in the aid of art to decorate his more lofty dwelling-place. But not alone the home of man must minister to his love of the beautiful; the Temple which he consecrates to the worship of his Creator must rear its stately columns, and spread its over-arching vault to form a fit sanctuary for holy thoughts and heaven-ward aspirations. As society advances, all the edifices which the multiplied wants of civilized life demand, must be beautified; hence arises decorative architecture."

The writer points out, with due appreciation, that "the immense resources for building in the United States will be profitably and tastefully appropriated, whenever the people themselves have sufficient knowledge of the art to employ and remunerate scientific architects." The necessity for obtaining proper professional assistance in erecting buildings is several times urged in other parts of the work. Mrs. Tutbill discriminates between mere building and architecture. "While society is in its infancy, and strength and convenience alone are regarded, it ranks with other mechanic arts

necessary to the comfort of man; but when it adds to these beauty of design or a regard for effect, it becomes an ornamental or fine art, taking its place beside the sister arts, poetry, painting, and sculpture."

Our lady writer, however, is fully aware that regard for effect alone will not make an architect.

"An architect must be practical. He cannot live in a world of fancy like the poet; he cannot copy nature in its loveliest aspects like the painter; nor perfect nature in forms of surpassing beauty and grace like the sculptor. He must render tasteful and beautiful that which is essential. In doing this he must not speculate and theorize till he has lost sight of the main object of all his works, utility. Practical knowledge must make him acquainted with all that is best adapted to ensure convenience, strength, and durability; and a constant regard to the earlier views prevent him from sacrificing the substance to the shadow—fitness to facitious ornament. He must be practical, too, in order to gain respect and confidence. A theorist may be expert in drawing plans, and fill his studio with an endless variety when only one good plan is needed: his own mind will wander amid this variety without being able to make a choice. If this choice is at length made by another, the theorizing man has so many alterations and additions to make in carrying on the work, that he puzzles and vexes the men whom he employs, and loses their confidence, by seeming to have no plan at all in his own mind. He will not be an economical artist. In following out a favourite theory, little regard will be paid to expense, and probably he will not be able to make an exact estimate, as he never knows when his plan is fixed; and, besides, he has not the patience to examine into minute details."

The ten last chapters are devoted to the architecture of the United States, and the improvement of cities, from which we shall make some extracts hereafter; and, in the meantime, we offer a hearty shake of the hand to the lady-writer on the other side of the wide Atlantic.

## THE BUILDER OF OSBORNE.

WE have received two or three letters on the subject of the new buildings at Osborne, complaining, first, of our giving Mr. Cubitt the title of architect in the heading of our view, and secondly, of the employment of that gentleman in the double capacity of architect and builder, by her Majesty, considering that such a precedent must be most prejudicial to the profession. As to the first, we did not give him the generic title of architect, nor does he assume it, so far as we know: we simply stated the fact in a particular case. The information sought, is, the name of the architect of Osborne House,—who was it designed, arranged, and superintended the building? and the reply must unquestionably be, Mr. Cubitt.

As to the second ground of complaint, we have so long and zealously laboured to promote the study of architecture as a science and a fine art, and to make its practice quite distinct from the pursuit of the builder, that it must be quite unnecessary for us now to say that, as a general rule, we fully agree with those who object to the union of the two callings in one person. We are contented, however, to look on Mr. Cubitt and the present case as an exception. Apart from the fact that he stands in a different position from any other builder, London owes him much for wide streets and comprehensive schemes of improvement, and it may be, though we do not pretend to say it is, that the illustrious person by whom he is employed, was willing to give some recognition of this, and finding him not disposed to act under the direction of others, may have thought fit to depart from the usual course in his favour.

Without yielding one jot of our consistency, we feel justified in withholding any observations in respect of this matter, calculated to annoy either the Owner or the builder of Osborne.

ENGINEERS' COMPETITION.—Plans for the drainage of the town of Guildford are wanted—particulars not stated.

\* "History of Architecture, from the Earliest Times to its present Condition in Europe and the United States: with a Biography of Eminent Architects, and a Glossary of Architectural Terms." By Mrs. L. C. Tutbill. With numerous illustrations. 1848. Philadelphia: Lindsay and Co.: London: John Chapman, 142, Strand.